

11 MARIA SOSA,

12 No. C 14-3666 RS

13 v. Plaintiff,
14 NATHANIEL BASOLA SOBAYO,
15 Defendant.

16 /
17 **ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION TO REMAND
ACTION**

18 This matter was filed as an unlawful detainer in San Mateo County Superior Court.
19 Appearing *in pro se*, defendant Mr. Sobayo filed a notice of removal. Upon removal, the case was
20 assigned to a magistrate judge. The magistrate judge issued an Order to Show Cause for removal
jurisdiction, as well as a Report and Recommendation that the matter be remanded to state court for
21 lack of jurisdictional grounds to support the removal. The matter was then reassigned to the
22 undersigned for disposition.

23 The time for objecting to the Report and Recommendation has expired and no objections
24 have been filed. For the reasons explained in the Report and Recommendation, removal jurisdiction
25 based on federal question or diversity is absent. As further explained in the Report and
26 Recommendation, the sole state-law claim for unlawful detainer stated in the complaint does not
27 provide a federal question basis for removal; it is purely a creature of California law. *Wells Fargo*
28

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 *Bank v. Lapeen*, 2011 WL 2194117, at *3 (N.D. Cal. June 6, 2011). And even if Mr. Sobayo were
2 to aver diversity jurisdiction, plaintiff Ms. Sosa brought this action in California. Mr. Sobayo is a
3 citizen of California and therefore is not entitled to removal on diversity grounds. *See* 28 U.S.C. §
4 1441(b)(2) (stating that a civil action “removable solely on the basis of the jurisdiction under section
5 1332(a) . . . may not be removed if any of the parties in interest properly joined and served as
6 defendants is a citizen of the State in which such action is brought”). While Mr. Sobayo’s Response
7 to the Order to Show Cause avers that the amount in controversy is \$1,630,500—in excess of the
8 \$75,000 minimum—it nevertheless fails to allege facts that surmount these other hurdles to removal
9 jurisdiction. Accordingly, this action is hereby remanded to San Mateo County Superior Court.

10

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12

13 Dated: 9/10/14

14



RICHARD SEEBORG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28